

M.D. Kassenova^{ID*}, R.M. Zhumashev^{ID}
Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: mika_88.10@bk.ru; zhumashev_rymbek@mail.ru)

From the history of translation Kazakh script into Latin graphic in the 1920 and 1930s.

The article covers the questions about Kazakh alphabet which was based on Latin graphics in 1920s and 1930s. The authors considered various positions of both supporters of the preservation and reform of Arabic graphic, and supporters of Latinization at the stage of discussion options of the new graphic and implementation of language policy. On basis of the historiographical material and the materials of the first Congress of Kazakh intellectuals in Orenburg in 1924 and the All-Union Turkological Congress in 1926, different views were revealed among the intellectuals on the question about Latinization, viable option of graphics, orthography of Kazakh language and unification of alphabets. The authors arrive at the conclusion that a part of the intellectuals stand against of initiation the new alphabet, explain singularity of Kazakh orthography and originality of the Kazakh language. In Kazakhstan, even before the start of the All-Union Turkological Congress, there was already a positive experience of reforming the Arabic graphics, which was adapted to the sound features of the Kazakh language. Party and state figures, who actively supported the Soviet power, had a different motivation and attitude towards Latinization. The question of reforming Arabic graphics to Latin graphics was illustrated on pages of scientific journals, had a discussion on scientific conferences and congresses, where protagonists and opponents of Latinization argued. The relative freedom of expression characteristic of the first decade of Soviet power was replaced by a rigid command administration that tolerated no dissent. Other opinions were declared hostile and after the repressions of the 1930s, the situation changed, and the issues of language policy were no longer widely discussed.

Keywords: new alphabet, unification of writing, Kazakh language, Arabic graphics, Latinization, national intelligence, Turkological Congress.

Introduction

The research relevance is the historical experience of introducing the Latin graphic in Kazakhstan in the 1920s and 1930s. Today, the leadership has decided to transition of Kazakh writing to a Latin-based alphabet by 2025. Patriotic politicians and political scientists advocating Latinization assure that the transition from Cyrillic to Latin is the civilized choice of Kazakh society in favor of a global open world. Linguists justify this transition by the convenience of transmitting specific sounds of the Kazakh language. The other supporters of Latinization justified by the special importance in the context of developing technologies and communications, as well as its positive impact on the scientific and educational process in Kazakhstan in the XXIst century.

Scientific analyses of works dedicated to the historical experience of introducing the Latin graphic in Kazakhstan during the 1920s and 1930s show that the authors of these publications are focused not so much on linguistic aspects, but rather on historical and, to a greater extent, political justifications for the transition of the Kazakh alphabet to the Latin graphic. This circumstance highlights the clear politicization of the issue of Latinization today. In this context, it is relevant to refer to the discussions of the 1920s regarding the transition to the Latin graphic, as it is interesting to analyze the positions and arguments put forth by Kazakh intellectuals in support of their choices. The analysis of the challenges faced by the scientific and pedagogical community in implementing the alphabet reform, initiated by the leadership's decision, is of great importance.

Materials and Research Methods

The history of transitioning the Kazakh script to the Latin graphic in the 1920s and 1930s, the authors used general scientific methods, such as analysis, synthesis, induction, and deduction, as well as the analysis of documents and materials of various congresses and conferences, other publications of representatives of Kazakh intellectuals in the period considered, the method of comparative analysis, the comparative historical method.

* Corresponding author's e-mail: mika_88.10@bk.ru

For a comprehensive understanding of the processes that occurred in the period studied, the works of domestic authors of the Soviet period, as well as the work of modern Kazakhstan and Russian researchers, were analyzed first.

The references addressing the implementation of the Latin graphic in the USSR during the 1920s–1930s can be divided into several groups based on chronological sequence and the level of material generalization: publications in periodicals from the 1920s and 1930s, studies by Soviet historians from the 1940s to the 1980s, works from the early 1990s, and modern research by Kazakh scholars.

However, the attempt to comprehensively understand the discourse surrounding the question of Latinization causes the need to study and analyze the documents and works written in the given period, which laid the foundation for a thorough examination of the theory and practice of Latinization in subsequent years.

In the first instance, we examine the stenographic records of speeches by Kazakh intellectuals in Orenburg in 1924 and at the All-Union Turkological Congress in Baku in 1926, where the question of transitioning the Kazakh language from Arabic to Latin was seriously debated.

In the absence of professional historians, the authors of articles on Latinization in the 1920s and 1930s were primarily party and state officials. Their works were typically highly ideological and reflected the party's agenda.

The authors also used the method of comparative analysis in the study of various positions, both supporters and opponents of Latinization of the Kazakh alphabet.

Discussion and Results

The radical transformation of the Soviet Union's cultural and educational spheres in the late 1920s and 1930s, often referred to in literature as the 'Cultural Revolution,' marked a significant leap in the development of a new cultural and civilizational space. In terms of writing, this becomes even more important, because the Soviet Union inherited from the Russian Empire so many ethnic groups who spoke different languages and used different systems of writing. Uniqueness of ethnic groups in their historical development creates a difference in systems of writing. The process of forming a new political system, which proclaimed national reconstruction as part of a unified state, demanded the unification of writing. Among the different systems of writing, the preference was given to the Latin graphic. The language policy and process of introducing Latin graphic by Soviet Union during the 1920s and 1930s was an integral part of the national-state construction [1; 8].

The new unified alphabet based on Latin graphic was decided to be introduced among all Turkic, as well as other ethnicities of the USSR. In fact, spread of new alphabets in the Turkish environment was carried out in conditions of harsh struggle with radical clergy and nationalist intellectuals, who resisted the introduction of Latin in every possible way.

Among the reasons for transitioning national languages to the Latin graphic instead of Cyrillic, the Soviet government's desire to avoid resistance from the national peripheries stands out as the most significant. The fact is that at this time, memories of the colonial policy of the Tsarist regime were still fresh, so the creation of a writing system based on Russian could have been perceived negatively.

The transition of the Kazakh language from Arabic script to the Latin graphic faced typical contradictions of the new alphabet, as well as resistance from parts of Kazakh society. However, the situation changed in the 1930s, with the rapid shift toward extensive socialist construction, which involved increased industrialization and, consequently, the accelerated training of professional personnel and mass literacy promotion. [2; 141].

The attitude towards Latinization among the national intelligence was far from unambiguous. The Arabic writing system links the Kazakh people to their traditional past, Islam, and national identity. The adoption of the Cyrillic alphabet by Kazakh intellectuals was seen as a form of Russification, despite their widespread fluency in Russian. The introduction of Latin for the national intellectuals was a difficult process to perceive, especially the part embedded in the state management apparatus, since it directly affected both the quality of their work and their position in society. As a result, a heated debate erupted in Kazakh society regarding the adoption of the new script, involving various representatives of the national intellectuals, politicians, publicists, poets, writers, linguists, and others.

A. Bukeikhanov posed a conceptual problem of national movement of Kazakh intellectuals and identified them as "Westerners" and "Turkophiles" [3; 76]. The "Westerners" which raised on Russian literature, believing in European culture, and considering religious issues to be secondary, there were supporters of

Latinization of the Kazakh alphabet. The “Turkophiles” and “Pan-Islamists”, who were influenced by Eastern traditionalism, strongly opposed Latinization, aligning them with Tatar intellectuals on this issue. Perhaps this is why the opponents of Latinization in the 1920s and 1930s were more prominent in Tatarstan and Kazakhstan.

According to D.A. Amanzholova, the group of national intellectuals who opposed Latinization was a minority and could not speak on behalf of the entire Kazakh people and express their interests [4]. The author reaches this conclusion based on the apparent lack of conflict between the authorities and the ethnic community during the alphabet reform process [4]. In the early years of Soviet power, a segment of Kazakh intellectuals, not aligned with the Alash movement or other nationalist and pan-Islamist groups, adhered to revolutionary principles and fully supported and promoted Soviet authority in Kazakhstan. Among the representatives of the new intelligentsia, who sincerely supported the Soviet power were T. Ryskulov, S. Seifullin and others [5; 205]. Her representatives were entirely guided by party attitudes. It was from this group that most party and state figures emerged, who were strong proponents of Latinization in the 1920s and 1930s. [2; 141].

In general, due to the commitment of the party ideology, the question of Latinization was considered by them as part of cultural revolution and class struggle. Soviet sociolinguist N. Yakovlev, being one of the main ideologists of Latinization in the USSR, noted that the struggle for Latinization in Turkish outskirts took on the form of the class struggles of the Soviet East proletariat for Soviet national culture, directed against the hostile conservative Muslim clergy, local feudal elites and the bourgeoisie [6; 26].

Also, in the bureaucratic apparatus in Kazakhstan were both delegates of the Kazakh intellectuals, who defended mostly Arabic graphics, and the younger generation of Kazakh intellectuals, supporters of Latinization. Under the guidance of the Scientific and Methodological Council (Narcomat) and People’s Commissariat for Enlightenment (Narkompros) at meeting the opponents and supporters of Latin graphics could speak equally freely about the new writing system.

The Arabs held leading positions in publishing houses and the press, as well as in People’s Commissariat for Enlightenment, headed by A. Baitursynuly, the author of the original spelling based on improved for the Kazakh language to Arabic script. A. Baitursynuly was supported by Kh. Dosmukhamedov, M. Dulatov, as well as several other representatives of the old intelligence. As an opponent of Latinization M. Dulatov justified his position by lack of funding, and that the Kazakh society can get even more illiterate [7]. Accordingly, he proposed to protect and improve the Turkic writing. Kh. Dosmukhamedov noted unlettered reserves of the Kazakh language, suggested not to rush to introduce new terms, but using them in public discussion. [7]. Public figure, pedagogue, publicist E. Omarovuly also advocated the importance of the use of Arabic script in the Kazakh language to preserve the cultural and written heritage of the Kazakhs. He wrote about this many times in his works. At the meeting, E. Omarovuly delivered a report on the issue of the Kazakh language’s spelling [8].

Supporters of the transition to Latin in the Turkish context, led by N. Tiuriakulov, played a key role in government activities. His significant contributions included his work as the People’s Commissar for Enlightenment, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkestan, Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Turkic Republic, and head of the Central Publishing House. It is important to note that N. Tiuriakulov was the author of the new alphabet and worked closely on the Latinization of Turkic scripts. Without exaggeration, he had a broader vision than many representatives of the national intelligentsia and was an advocate for the unification of Turkic alphabets based on the Latin graphic.

The writing system on Latin graphics was supported by T. Zhurgenev, S. Asfendiyarov, O. Zhandosov, I. Kabulov, T. Shonanov. T Shonanov being a fierce propagandist of the new Kazakh alphabet, headed the “Society of Amateurs of the New Alphabet”, created under the Scientific and Methodological Council of the People’s Commissariat for Enlightenment of the KASSR (Narcomprom). However, among the Latinists, there were many who advocated for a gradual transition to the new writing system. They suggested using A. Baitursynuly’s developments in the field of Kazakh spelling and opposed the idea of a complete unification of the alphabet [9; 70]

According to the results of the congress of Kazakh education workers in Orenburg in 1924, 9 members of the congress supported the position of N. Tiuriakulov, and 8 members supported the position of A. Baitursynuly [7]. N. Tiuriakulov noted that there was no sense in the forced introduction of the Latin alphabet and emphasized the need for serious research on the issue. As an alternative, he argued that the spread of Latin graphics should be seen as a form of cultural progress that could not be stopped, as the public was gradually becoming accustomed to it. Tiuriakulov also pointed out the practicality and cost-effectiveness of

Latin graphics from a typographical perspective [7]. A. Baitursynuly criticized the typographical advantages of the Latin graphic at the congress, calling such a step “a fascination with only the visible side of the matter”. He argued that the Latin graphic was not as easy as it seemed and cautioned against a strong enthusiasm for it, considering it an old and dead alphabet. He also referenced research by German specialists, who concluded that Arabic writing is, in fact, perceived faster and more easily than Latin [10; 24].

The next level of discussion between supporters and opponents of the Latin graphic took place at the First All-Union Congress of Turkic Studies in Baku, where an official decision was made to transition the Turkic republics from the Arabic script to a unified Latin alphabet. The goal of this transition was to “construct the alphabet for the individual peoples so that they (alphabets) do not create sharp isolating barriers between the languages, contribute to the convergence of brotherly peoples, and at the same time reflect the peculiarities of each language” [11].

The Kazakh Republic was represented at the congress by four delegates: A. Baitursynuly, E. Omarovuly, A. Baysentayev, and B. Suleev. Their views on the Latin graphic differed significantly. A. Baitursynuly and E. Omarovuly advocated for the improvement of the Arabic script to better suit the peculiarities of the Kazakh language and, as a result, opposed Latinization. In his report on scientific terminology, A. Baitursynuly emphasized the importance of ensuring the unity of literary and spoken languages, while E. Omarovuly delivered a report on the issue of Kazakh spelling [12; 54]. Meanwhile, Baysentayev and B. Suleev faced difficulty in supporting specific proposals due to their insufficient knowledge of the issue and were absent from the congress hall during the vote [12; 54].

N. Tiuriakulov criticized the participants of the congress, accusing them of discrediting the activities of the First All-Union Turkological Congress and sabotaging the writing reform [13; 218]. Additionally, he criticized the editors of the newspaper “*Zhana mektep*” and the People’s Commissariat for Enlightenment of the Kazakh ASSR, which was responsible for the education of Kazakh teachers. His criticism focused on the absence of publications from supporters of Latinization in the journal, which was, among other things, led by A. Baitursynuly. In contrast, there was a noticeable presence of articles only from defenders of the Arabic script.

The main opponent of Latinization was Tatar delegation and part of the Kazakh delegate, who announced that the experience of Azerbaijan is unconvincing and do not deserve propagation among Turkic peoples, and all achievement should be directed to the reform the Arabic alphabet. However, the supporters of the new alphabet at the congress were the majority. The discussion at the congress reflected the public’s views and assessments of Latin alphabet. According to opponents, the Latin alphabet isolated Muslim peoples from the Islamic community and separated them from Islam.

On April 24, 1927, a General Meeting of Kazakh students was held in Moscow, where N. Tiuriakulov delivered a report on the new alphabet. The students emphasized that its implementation requires systematic and persistent work over a long period. They noted that any forcing or coercion could hinder the cultural development in Kazakhstan.

A. Baitursynuly continued his work on improving his alphabet project, demonstrating the advantages and capabilities of improved Arabic graphics, including its use in typography, and learning practices in comparison with Latin and Cyrillic alphabets [14; 281]. Proving the viability of the of the Arabic script, A. Baitursynuly published in 1927 his report on all the merits of the alphabet based on Arabic script in the book “*Alippe Aitysy*” (Alphabet Competition) [14; 279]. A. Baitursynuly later noted that the Latin graphic could not be applied to Turkic languages in its current form and that it would require serious reform, with adjustments of at least 25–30%. He permitted the parallel existence of two graphs and a gradual transition from Arabic graph to Latin, provided that the Latin graphic is acceptable for the already existing method of teaching, reading and writing, as well as easier visual perception [10; 24].

In 1928, at a meeting in Baku, a group headed by O. Zhandosov, which included A. Baidildauli, T. Shonanuly, I. Kabyluly, I. Zhansugiruly, and Sh. Tokzhigit, presented the Kazakh project for a new script consisting of 28 letters, based on the Arabic alphabet as proposed by A. Baitursynuly. This project was also discussed in 1929 at the Scientific-Orthographic Conference in Kyzyl-Orda by T. Shonanuly, E. Omarov, K. Kemengerov, K. Zhubanov, E.D. Polivanov, and others. E.D. Polivanov noted A. Baitursynuly’s contribution to graphical reform before the linguists of other Turkic countries, calling the graph presented by Kazakhstan the best among others.

The transition from Arabic to Latin graphic was actively promoted among the broader population. The introduction of the Latin graphic was justified by the complexity of the Arabic script, which has many monosomic letters, and the assertion that terminology from other, more developed languages creates signifi-

cant difficulties for Turkic languages. Additionally, the political leadership aimed to distance the masses from the influence of the clergy. The goal was to introduce Latin graphic to the working people so that the new generation would no longer read religious texts.

The resistance of the Arabist, according to the party leadership of the republic, was mostly broken by the end of 1928. In July 1929, the Central Executive Committee (CEC) and the government of Kazakhstan approved the state alphabet based on Latin graphic. The transition to a new alphabet for other Turkic-speaking peoples and various linguistic groups in the USSR began in 1929–1930. The People's Commissariat for Enlightenment of the RSFSR established a special commission to transition from the Cyrillic alphabet to Latin graphic, declaring the Cyrillic alphabet “a relic of Great Russian national chauvinism and forced Russification”. The transition to Latin graphics was followed orders of party and state bodies and became an instrument of Soviet national policy.

According to G. Tohzhano, the opponents of the Latin graphic were found among the staff of schools and press organizations within the party and state structure. [9; 71]. By the decision of the SNK of the Kazakh SSR, the state apparatus had to switch to the Latin alphabet in office work in 1930, but in practice this was accomplished in central institutions by 1934. In the local level and villages, the Arabic alphabet continued to play an important communicative role, along with Russian. Even in regions and district institutions, managers had difficulty learning the new alphabet and preferred to write in Arabic. The production of typewriters for Latin graphic was a very difficult task [18; 71]. The early introduction of the Latin alphabet resulted in graduates of special literacy schools being illiterate in Latin writing.

The reformers attempted to attribute the problems of introducing the Latin alphabet among the broader population to shortcomings in organizational and political work, as well as sabotage by traditional Arabists. However, the use of administrative and command methods in the reform of writing, along with framing the Latin alphabet as part of a class struggle against nationalistic intelligentsia and Islamic clergy — viewed as remnants of the exploitative system — did not significantly stimulate language development. The allocation of financial resources, the development of publications, and the prohibition of Arabic writing ultimately facilitated the introduction of Latin graphic to the masses. [19; 72].

The transition to the new alphabet complicated efforts to eliminate illiteracy, as already literate individuals needed to be retrained. To implement these plans effectively, it was essential to train appropriate personnel — liquidators of illiteracy in the new alphabet and organizers-methodologists for literacy schools. However, the Latinization of alphabets, as envisioned by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was not supported by an adequate material base. [1; 10].

However, the further course of the development of society showed the inconveniences and disadvantages of the Latin alphabet. The Latin alphabet was introduced by the political leadership, which, back in the 1920s, had plans for a world revolution and envisioned a future world socialist state for workers. However, with the strengthening of I. Stalin's power, it became clear that a world revolution would not occur. From 1932 to 1933, a campaign for the consolidation of Latinization was launched. However, the process of Latinization did not reach a logical conclusion, as it was suspended by the agreement of the ruling elite headed by I. Stalin.

A few researchers argue that the discussion surrounding the transition of Kazakh writing to Latin graphic initially had a political background rooted in Russification. They contend that the adoption of Latin graphic for Kazakh writing ultimately facilitated its replacement with Russian script, which, in turn, contributed to the policy of Russification.

The Cyrillic alphabet was introduced in the USSR in the 1940s. A project for the Kazakh alphabet based on Cyrillic script was prepared and introduced in August 1939, with S. Amanzholov, the head of the Kazakh branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, as its author. However, there was no widespread discussion within the scientific or public spheres regarding this topic. In fact, after the mass repressions of the 1930s, there was virtually no discussion about the transition from Latin to Cyrillic script.

The period of language experiments was terminated in favor of the Cyrillization of Writing. The transition Kazakh alphabet to Cyrillic graphics, Repression of Kazakh Intellectuals conducted to the soundlessness and removal all debates about Latin graphics from scientific publication, which negatively affected of historical research in this field.

Conclusions

Given the exceptional heterogeneity of the linguistic space of the Soviet Union, the central authorities sought to create a unified written language that would serve as a foundation for the new socialist society.

Among the Muslim peoples of the USSR, Latinization replaced the Arabic script, which was used mainly for religious purposes. As Latinization was introduced, there was a detachment of the population from the influence of Arabic literature, the introduction of the ideas of Soviet power based on the new writing system, and the rapprochement of Muslim peoples with other peoples of the USSR.

The older generation of national intelligentsia opposed the introduction of a new alphabet based on the Latin alphabet, considering this action as an attempt on the national identity, giving special value to the self-consciousness of the Kazakh ethnoses.

By the beginning of the work of the Baku Congress in 1926, Kazakhstan already had a positive experience of reforming Arabic graphics, which was adapted to the sound features of the Kazakh language.

The question of transitioning Kazakh writing from Arabic to Latin graphic in the 1920s was widely covered in scientific journals and the Kazakh press. It was discussed at local assemblies, as well as at scientific conferences and congresses at both the republican and union levels, where supporters and opponents of Latinization voiced their opinions. After the mass repressions of the 1930s, the situation in the scientific and social environment changed dramatically, and issues of language policy, along with any state matters, were no longer widely discussed. During the initial years of its existence, Soviet historical science was under strict control by the authorities, influenced by dogmatic Marxism and a class-based research strategy regarding the historical past.

The question of the native language greatly concerned the national intelligentsia in the 20th century. Today, the issue of transitioning Kazakh writing to Latin graphic has resurfaced in connection with global trends. The debates surrounding this transition in the 20th century remind us of the need for thorough research on the issue and a balanced approach.

References

- 1 Даудов А.Х. Из истории латинизации национальных алфавитов СССР / А.Х.Даудов, Е.П. Мальшева // Вестник СПбГУ. Сер. 2. История. — 2011. — Вып. 2. — С. 7–12.
- 2 Волков А.Ю. Партийное руководство культурным строительством в Казахстане (1917–1987 гг.) / А.Ю. Волков, А.Е. Ержанов // Историко-партийная наука в Казахстане: некоторые проблемы историографии. — Алма-Ата, 1988 — С. 79–98.
- 3 Букейханов А. Избранное / А. Букейханов — Алматы: Қазақ энциклопедиясы, 1995. — 269 с.
- 4 Аманжолова Д.А. Языковая политика и культура управленцев Казахской АССР.1920–1936 гг. / Д.А. Аманжолова // Российские регионы: взгляд в будущее. — 2016. — № 2 (7). — С. 36–61.
- 5 Сулейменов Р.Б. Историография культурной революции / Р.Б. Сулейменов // Историческая наука Советского Казахстана (1917–1960 гг.): Очерки становления и развития. — Алма-Ата: Ғылым, 1990. — С. 206–207.
- 6 Яковлев Н. О развитии и очередных проблемах латинизации алфавитов / Н. Яковлев // Революция и письменность. — 1936. — № 2. — С. 25–38.
- 7 Муканова Г.К. Вехи идентичности: диаспора и первый научный казахский съезд, 1924 г. (Архивные находки) [Электронный ресурс] / Г.К. Муканова // Scientific E-journal «edu.e-history.kz». — Режим доступа: <http://edu.e-history.kz/en/publications/view/107>
- 8 Омарұлы Е. Шығармалар = Сочинения / Е. Омарұлы; құраст. М. Шуақиев, А. Шаяхмет. — Қостанай: Ахмет Байтұрсынұв атынд. Қостанай мем. ун-ті, 2016. — 341 б.
- 9 Тогжанов Г. История движения и победы нового алфавита среди казаков / Г. Тогжанов // Алфавит Октября. Итоги введения нового алфавита среди народов РСФСР. Сб.ст. под общей ред. Н. Нурмакова. — М. -Л., 1934. — С. 60–72.
- 10 Полемика о выборе алфавита. — Кзыл-Орда: Казгиз, 1927. — 145 с.
- 11 Гранде Б. Унификация алфавитов [Электронный ресурс] / Б. Гранде. — Режим доступа: <http://www2.unil.ch/slav/ling/textes/GRANDE-34/Grande34.html>
- 12 Культурное строительство в Казахстане (1918–1932 гг.) // Сборник документов и материалов. — Алма-Ата: Казахстан, 1965. — Т. 1. — С. 45–79.
- 13 Тюрякулов Н. К вопросу о латинизации тюркских алфавитов / Н. Тюрякулов // В борьбе за новый алфавит. Издание Научной ассоциации востоковедения при ЦИК СССР. — Москва-Ленинград, 1925. — С. 89–102.
- 14 Байтұрсынұлы А. Бес томдық шығармалар жинағы. 4-т. Әліппелер мен мақалар / А. Байтұрсынұлы. — Алматы: «Алаш», 2006. — Б. 275–283.
- 15 Стенографический отчет научно-орфографической конференции, созванной 2–4 июля 1929 г. Научно-методическим Советом НКП и ЦКНТА. — Алматы, 1930. — 326 с.
- 16 Первый Всесоюзный тюркологический съезд 26 февраля — 5 марта 1926 г. (Стенографический отчет). — Баку, 1926. / Репринт издания. — Баку: Нагыл Еви, 2011. — 550 с.

17 Алпатов В.М. 150 языков и политика. 1917–1997 / В.М. Алпатов // Социолингвистические проблемы СССР и постсоветского пространства. — М.: Институт востоковедения РАН, 1997. — 192 с.

18 Латинизация алфавита — орудие пролетарской революции // Алфавит Октября. Итоги введения нового алфавита среди народов РСФСР. Сб. ст. под общей ред. Н. Нурмакова. М.-Л., 1934. — С. 60–72.

19 Базарова В.В. Языковые эксперименты и практика политических технологий в 1920–1930-х гг. / В.В. Базарова // Власть. — 2009. — № 2. — С. 72–74.

20 Исхан Б.Ж. Языковая политика и казахский алфавит / Б.Ж. Исхан, С.Б. Даутова, Б.Р. Оспанова // Успехи современного естествознания. — 2014. — № 9 (1). — С. 136–140.

М.Д. Касенова, Р.М. Жумашев

1920–1930 жылдардағы қазақ жазуының латын графикасының негізіне көшу тарихынан

Мақала 1920–1930 жылдардағы қазақ жазуын латын графикасына көшіру мәселесін талқылауға арналған. Жаңа графика нұсқаларын талқылауда тіл саясатын жүзеге асырушылардың, араб графикасын сақтау мен реформалауды жақтаушылардың, латын графикасын қолдаушылардың да әртүрлі ұстанымдары да зерделенген. Тарихнамалық материалды талдау 1924 ж. Орынбордағы қазақстандық ағарту қызметкерлері съезінің және 1926 ж. Бүкілодақтық түркология съезінің материалдарын зерделеу негізінде зиялы қауым арасында латын графикасының қолайлы нұсқасына қазақ тілінің орфографиясы мен әліпбиді біріздендіру мәселесі бойынша әртүрлі көзқарастар анықталды. Авторлар зиялы қауымның едәуір бөлігі орфографияның ерекшелігі мен қазақ тілінің өзіндік ерекшелігін негіздей отырып, жаңа әліпбиді енгізуге қарсы болды деген қорытынды жасаған. Қазақстанда Бүкілодақтық түркология съезінің жұмысы басталғанға дейін де қазақ тілінің дыбыстық ерекшеліктеріне бейімделген араб графикасын реформалаудың оң тәжірибесі болған. Кеңес өкіметін белсенді қолдаған партия және мемлекет қайраткерлерінің латындандыруға деген ынтасы мен көзқарасы басқаша болды. Араб графикасынан латынға көшу мәселесі ғылыми журнал беттерінде жазылып, ғылыми конференциялар мен съездерде талқыланып, латындандыруды жақтаушылар да, қарсылар да сөз сөйледі. Кеңес өкіметінің алғашқы онжылдығына сөз бостандығының орнына басқа пікірмен келіспейтін қатаң командалық басқару келді. 1930 жылдардағы қуғын-сүргіннен кейін жағдай мүлде өзгеріп, өзге пікірлер дұшпандық деп жарияланып, тіл саясаты мәселелері енді кең түрде талқыланды.

Кілт сөздер: жаңа әліпби, жазуды біріздендіру, қазақ тілі, араб графикасы, латындандыру, ұлттық зиялы қауым.

М.Д. Касенова, Р.М. Жумашев

Из истории перевода казахской письменности на латинскую графическую основу в 1920–1930-е годы

Статья посвящена анализу дискуссии о латинизации казахской письменности в 1920–1930-е гг. Авторами рассмотрены различные позиции как сторонников сохранения и реформирования арабской графики, так и сторонников перехода на латиницу в ходе обсуждения вариантов новой графики и реализации языковой политики. На основе анализа историографических источников, а также изучения материалов Съезда казахстанских работников просвещения в Оренбурге (1924 г.) и Всесоюзного тюркологического съезда (1926 г.) выявлены различные взгляды казахской интеллигенции по вопросу латинизации, выбора приемлемой графики, орфографии казахского языка и унификации алфавитов. Авторы пришли к выводу, что значительная часть интеллигенции выступала против введения нового алфавита, обосновывая это особенностью орфографии и самобытностью казахского языка. В Казахстане ещё до начала работы Всесоюзного тюркологического съезда уже существовал успешный опыт реформирования арабской графики, приспособленной к звуковым особенностям казахского языка. В то же время Партийные и государственные деятели, активно поддерживавшие советскую власть, имели иную мотивацию и отношение к латинизации. Вопрос о переходе с арабской графики на латиницу освещался на страницах научных журналов, обсуждался на научных конференциях и съездах, где выступали как сторонники, так и противники латинизации. Однако относительная свобода выражения мнений, характерная для первого десятилетия советской власти, вскоре сменилась жестким административным управлением, не терпящим инакомыслия. Иное мнение стало рассматриваться как враждебное, а после репрессий 1930-х гг. положение изменилось, и вопросы языковой политики перестали быть предметом дискуссии.

Ключевые слова: новый алфавит, унификация письменности, казахский язык, арабская графика, латинизация, национальная интеллигенция.

References

- 1 Daudov, A.Kh. (2011). Iz istorii latinizatsii natsionalnykh alfavitov SSSR [From the history of latinization of the national alphabets of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics]. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Seriya 2, Istoriiia — Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. History, 2*, 7–12 [in Russian].
- 2 Volkov, A.U. & Yerzhanov, A.E. (1988). Partiinoe rukovodstvo kulturnym stroitelstvom v Kazakhstane (1917–1987 gg.) [Party leadership of cultural construction in Kazakhstan (1917–1987)]. *Istoriko-partiinaia nauka v Kazakhstane: nekotorye problemy istoriografii — Historical and party science in Kazakhstan: some problems of historiography*. Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan [in Russian].
- 3 Bukeikhanov, A. (1995). *Izbrannoe [Selected]*. Almaty: Qazaq entsiklopediiasy [in Russian].
- 4 Amanzholova, D.A. (2016). Yazykovaia politika i kultura upravlentsev Kazakhskoi ASSR. 1920–1936 gg. [Language policy and culture of managers of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic 1920–1936]. *Rossiiskie regiony: vzgliad v budushchee. — Russian regions: the look into the future, 2* (7), 36–61 [in Russian].
- 5 Suleimenov, R.B. (1990). Istoriofafiia kulturnoi revoliutsii [Historiography of the cultural revolution]. *Istoricheskaia nauka Sovetskogo Kazakhstana (1917–1960 gg.): Ocherki stanovleniia i razvitiia — Historiographic science of Soviet Kazakhstan. (1917–1960): Essays on Formation and Development*. Alma-Ata: Gylym [in Russian].
- 6 Yakovlev, N. (1936). O razvitiu i ocherednykh problemakh latinizatsii alfavitov [On the development and next problems of latinization of alphabets]. *Revoliutsiia i pismennost — Revolution and writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.kyraha.com/modules/content/index.php?id=2> [in Russian].
- 7 Mukanova, G.K. (2010). Vekhi identichnosti: diaspora i pervyi nauchnyi kazakhskii sezd, 1924 g. (Arkhivnye nakhodki) [Milestones of Identity: diaspora and the first scientific Kazakh congress in 1924 (Archival Finds)]. *edu.e-history.kz*. Retrieved from <http://edu.e-history.kz/en/publications/view/107> [in Russian].
- 8 Omarovuly, E. (2016). *Shygarmalar = Sochineniia [Essays]*. Shuakaev, M., Shaiakhmet, A. (Comp.). Kostanay, Ahmet Baitursynov atyndagy Kostanay Memlekettik University [in Kazakh].
- 9 Tohzhhanov, G. (1934). Istoriiia dvizheniia i pobedy novogo alfavita sredi kazakov [History of the movement and victory of the new alphabet among the Kazakhs]. *Alfavit Oktiabria. Itogi vvedeniia novogo alfavita sredi narodov Rossiiskoi Sovetskoi Federativnoi Sotsialisticheskoi Respubliki — Alphabet of October. Results of the introduction of the new alphabet among the peoples of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic*. Moscow-Leningrad [in Russian].
- 10 (1927). *Polemika o vybore alfavita [Polemic on the choice of alphabet]*. Kzyl-Orda: Kazgiz [in Russian].
- 11 Grande, B. (1934). Unifikatsiia alfavitov [Unification of alphabets]. *unil.ch*. Retrieved from <http://www2.unil.ch/slav/ling/textes/GRANDE-34/Grande34.html> [in Russian].
- 12 (1965). Kulturnoe stroitelstvo v Kazakhstane (1918–1932 gg.) [Cultural construction in Kazakhstan (1918–1932)]. *Sbornik dokumentov i materialov — Collection of documents and materials*. Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan [in Russian].
- 13 Tiuriakulov, N. (1925). K voprosu o latinizatsii tiurkiskikh alfavitov [On the question of the Latinization of Turkic alphabets]. *V borbe za novyi alfavit. Izdanie Nauchnoi assotsiatsii vostokovedeniia pri Tsentralnom Iсполnitelnom Komitete Soiuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik — In the Struggle for a New Alphabet. Publication of the Scientific Association of Oriental Studies under the Central Executive Committee of the USSR*. Moscow-Leningrad [in Russian].
- 14 Baitursynuly, A. (2006). *Bes tomdyq shygarmalar zhinagy. Alippeler men maqalar [Collection of works. Alphabet and articles]*. (Vol. 4). Almaty: “Alash” [in Kazakh].
- 15 (1930). *Stenograficheskii otchet nauchno-orfograficheskoi konferentsii, sozvannoi 2–4 iulia 1929 g. Nauchno-metodicheskim Sovetom NKP i TsKNTA [Verbatim report of the scientific orthographic conference, July 2–4, 1929, by the Scientific and Methodological Council of the People’s Commissariat for Education and the Central Committee of the Scientific and Technical Committee]*. Almaty [in Russian].
- 16 (2011). Pervyi Vsesoiuznyi tiurkologicheskii sezd 26 fevralia — 5 marta 1926 g. [First All-Union Turkological Congress February 26 — March 5, 1926]. *Stenograficheskii otchet — Verbatim record*. Baku: Nağil evi [in Russian].
- 17 Alpatov, V.M. (1997). 150 yazykov i politika. 1917–1997 [150 languages and politics since 1917–1997]. *Sotsiolingvisticheskie problemy SSSR i postsovetskogo prostranstva — Sociolinguistic problems of the USSR and the post-Soviet space*. Moscow. Institut vostokovedeniia Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk [in Russian].
- 18 Nurmakov, N. (1934). Latinizatsiia alfavita — orudie proletarskoi revoliutsii [Latinization of the alphabet — a weapon of the proletarian revolution]. *Alfavit Oktiabria. Itogi vvedeniia novogo alfavita sredi narodov Rossiiskoi Sovetskoi Federativnoi Sotsialisticheskoi Respubliki. — Alphabet of October. Results of the introduction of the new alphabet among the peoples of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic*. Leningrad [in Russian].
- 19 Bazarova, V.V. (2009). Yazykovye eksperimenty i praktika politicheskikh tekhnologii v 1920–1930-kh gg. [Language experiments and the practice of political technologies in the 1920s–1930s]. *Vlast — Power, 2*, 72–74 [in Russian].
- 20 Iskhan, B., Dautova, S.B., & Ospanova, B.R. (2014). Yazykovaia politika i kazakhskii alfavit [Language policy and the Kazakh alphabet]. *Uspekhi sovremennogo estestvoznaniia — The successes of modern natural science* 9 (1), 136–140 [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Kassenova Meruyert — PhD Student, Lecturer of the Department of History of Kazakhstan and Assembly of Peoples, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7806-2412>

Zhumashev Rymbek — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of the Department of Archeology, Ethnology, and Kazakhstan History, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4518-394X>